



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,574	10/28/2007	John G. Hildebrand	CCPC 0122 PUSA3	3032
50764 7590 01/30/2009 BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C. 1000 TOWN CENTER TWENTY-SECOND FLOOR SOUTHFIELD, MI 48075			EXAMINER CHEN, CAI Y	
			ART UNIT 2425	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/30/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

10/597,574

**Applicant(s)**

HILDEBRAND ET AL.

**Examiner**

CAI CHEN

**Art Unit**

2425

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 28 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 July 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE-08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/12/2007.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 28 objected to because of the following informalities:

The claim 28 has a grammatical error on recites claim limitation of "outputs the transcoded payloads the multiplexer".

There are numerous grammatical errors through out the disclosure, and applicant requires making sure the entire disclosure is free of errors.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 28 recites the limitation "the bypass payloads" in page 12, line 26.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 16, 19 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dureau (US 2003/0135860 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Dureau discloses a method of supporting operation of legacy customer equipment in a system where at least a portion of the legacy customer equipment receives non-supported signals (abstract), the method comprising:

configuring a transcoding unit for operation with the legacy customer equipment, the transcoding unit configured to transcode non-supported signals to supported signals which are compatible with the customer equipment (Fig. 4 and 5, abstract, para. 32, para. 35, para. 43-45).

Regarding claim 16, Dureau discloses a system of providing digital television signals to a media output device (abstract), the system comprising:

a host configured to decode signals carried in payloads of a first payload type for playback on the media output device (Fig. 3, para. 6, para. 23, para. 32, the TV video signal is being received and decoded from the set top box to be playback on display device like TV, computer, or cell phone); and

a unit configured for transcoding digital television signals carried in payloads of a second payload type to the first payload type for output to the host, the second payload type being associated with protocols dissimilar to protocols associated with the first payload type (Fig. 4-6, abstract, para. 32-33, para. 35-

Art Unit: 2425

38, para. 43-44, para. 47, the set top box configured to have the MPEG 4 data payload transcoded into MPEG 2 data format for compatibility and where MPEG 2 refers as first payload, and MPEG 4 is second payload).

Regarding claim 19, Dureau further discloses a provider for providing the signals in a first transport stream, wherein the first transport stream carries the signals in payloads of the first and second payload types (The service provider to transmit the MPEG 1, 2, or 4 data in one data stream, see para. 35).

Regarding claim 26, Dureau discloses a transcoding unit for use with legacy settop boxes (STBs) which only supports playback of digital television (DTV) signals encoded according to non-advance video compression (AVC) standards and not DTV signals encoded according to AVC standards (abstract, Fig. 3, para. 33-35), the transcoding unit comprising:

a transcoder configured to transcode DTV signals associated with the AVC standards to DTV signals associated with non-AVC standards so as to permit playback of the transcoded DTV signals with the legacy STB (The DTV signal such as MPEG 4(AVC standard) can be transcoded into MPEG-2 (non-AVC standard) format, see Fig. 3, abstract, para. 23, para. 33-36, para. 43-44, para. 47).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dureau in view of Candelore (US 2003/0046686 A1)

Regarding claim 2, Dureau discloses all limitation of claim 1. Dureau further discloses wherein the legacy customer equipment are set top boxes (STBs) and wherein the method further comprises configuring the transcoding unit to interface through a card interface of the STBs (Fig. 4 and 5, abstract, el. 12 is refers as set top box, el. 310, the transcode system is a circuit card are part of system of the set top box and configuring to interface with the set top box).

Dureau does not explicitly disclose set top box having onboard conditional access decryption capabilities.

Candelore teaches set top box having onboard conditional access decryption capabilities (Fig. 2, el. 136 and 140, para. 40-41).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to modify Dureau set top box to include having onboard conditional access decryption capabilities, as taught by Candelore, in order to decrypt the TV signal (para. 40-41).

5. Claims 3-5, 13-15, and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dureau in view of Chen (US 2005/002253 A1)

Regarding claim 3, Dureau discloses a method of transcoding dissimilar payloads carried in a first transport stream (abstract, para. 35), the method comprising:

demultiplexing the first transport stream to recover first and second payloads (para. 34-35, and 39, service provider to transport the content data contains HTML data, MPEG 1 data, MPEG 2 data, are being demultiplexed at the set top box);

transcoding the second payload to a protocol associated with the first payload if a protocol associated with the second payload is dissimilar from the protocol associated with the first payload (Fig. 4-6, abstract, para. 32-33, para. 35-38, para. 43-44, para. 47, the MPEG 4 data payload is transcoded into MPEG 2 data format for compatibility and where MPEG 2 refers as first payload, and MPEG 4 is second payload);

Dureau does not explicitly disclose multiplexing the first payload and the transcoded second payload to a second transport stream.

Chen teaches multiplexing the first payload and the [transcoded] second payload to a second transport stream (Fig. 1, para. 14, para. 21-22).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to modify Dureau to include multiplexing the first payload and the [transcoded]

Art Unit: 2425

second payload to a second transport stream, as taught by Chen, in order to deliver the desired payload to the user.

Regarding claim 4, Dureau in view of Chen discloses further comprising associating the first payload with MPEG-2 protocols and associating the second payload with AVC protocols such the second payload is transcoded to MPEG-2 protocols (Dureau, Fig. 4-6, abstract, para. 32-33, para. 35-38, para. 43-44, para. 47, AVC protocol standard can be MPEG 4 protocol, thus if the payload for MPEG 4 (second payload) is not compatible then the MPEG 4 payload will be transcoded into MPEG 2 payload (first payload) format).

Regarding claim 5, Dureau in view of Chen further discloses associating the AVC protocols with MPEG-4 protocols (Dureau, para. 35).

Regarding claim 13, Dureau in view of Chen further discloses associating the first transport stream with MPEG-2 protocols (Dureau, para. 35).

Regarding claim 14, Dureau in view of Chen further discloses determining if the protocol associated with the second payload is dissimilar from the protocol associated with the first payload as a function of instructions associated with the MPEG-2 protocols of the first transport stream (Dureau, Fig. 4-6, abstract, para. 32-33, para. 35-38, para. 43-44, para. 47).



Art Unit: 2425

Regarding claim 15, Dureau in view of Chen further discloses associating the first and second transport streams with MPEG-2 protocols (The video data transport streams are transcoded to the target/desire (MPEG-2) format, see Dureau, Fig. 4-6, abstract, para. 32-33, para. 35-38, para. 43-44, para. 47).

Regarding claim 20, Dureau discloses wherein the unit includes a demultiplexer for demultiplexing the first transport stream to recover the payloads (para. 34-35, and 39, service provider to transport the content data contains HTML data, MPEG 1 data, MPEG 2 data, are being demultiplexed at the set top box);

a transcoder for transcoding the second payload type to the first payload type (Fig. 4-6, abstract, para. 32-33, para. 35-38, para. 43-44, para. 47, the MPEG 4 data payload is transcoded into MPEG 2 data format for compatibility and where MPEG 2 refers as first payload, and MPEG 4 is second payload);

Dureau does not explicitly disclose a multiplexer for multiplexing payloads of the first payload type with [transcoded] payloads of the second payload type to a second transport stream for output to the host.

Chen teaches a multiplexer for multiplexing payloads of the first payload type with [transcoded] payloads of the second payload type to a second transport stream for output to the host (Fig. 1, para. 14, para. 21-22).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to modify Dureau to include multiplexing the first payload and the [transcoded]

Art Unit: 2425

second payload to a second transport stream, as taught by Chen, in order to deliver the desired payload to the user.

Regarding claim 21, Dureau in view of Chen discloses wherein the unit includes a bypass for bypassing payloads associated with the first payload type past the transcoder to the multiplexer such that the bypassed payloads are multiplexed at the multiplexer with the transcoded payloads (Dureau, MPEG 2 format is been pass without transcoding, and MPEG 4 format is being transcode to the MPEG 2 format, in the end the two format being multiplexed together, see Dureau, para. 34-35 and 39, Chen, Fig. 1, para. 14, and 21).

Regarding claim 22, Dureau in view of Chen discloses wherein the transcoder only transcodes payloads from the second payload type to the first payload type (Dureau, Fig. 4-6, abstract, para. 32-33, para. 35-38, para. 43-44, para. 47, the MPEG 4 data payload is transcoded into MPEG 2 data format for compatibility and where MPEG 2 refers as first payload; MPEG 4 is second payload; and wherein the desired compatible format is MPEG 2, the MPEG-4 is only to transcode to the MPEG-2 to be compatible).

Regarding claim 23, Dureau in view of Chen further discloses wherein the host is a settop box (STB) (Dureau, Fig. 1, el. 12, para. 23).

Art Unit: 2425

6. Claims 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dureau in view of Chen and further in view of Kadono (US 2004/0246373 A1)

Regarding claim 6, Dureau discloses all limitation of claim 1.

Dureau in view of Chen does not explicitly disclose associating the AVC protocols with H.264 protocols.

Kadono teaches associating the AVC protocols with H.264 protocols (para. 5).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to modify Dureau in view of Chen to include associating the AVC protocols with H.264 protocols, as taught by Kadono, in order to use the industry well known standardization format in picture coding method.

7. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dureau in view of Chen and further in view of Candelore (US 2003/0046686 A1).

Regarding claim 7, Dureau in view of Chen discloses all limitation of claim 3.

Dureau in view of Chen does not explicitly disclose decrypting conditional access (CA) encryption of the first transport stream prior to demultiplexing.

Candelore teaches disclose decrypting conditional access (CA) encryption of the first transport stream prior to demultiplexing (Fig. 2, 5, and 8, el. 296-el. 288, para. 40-41, para. 60-64, para. 84-85, para. 94).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to modify Dureau in view of Chen set top box to include decrypting conditional access (CA) encryption of the first transport stream prior to demultiplexing, as taught by Candelore, in order to decrypt the TV signal (para. 40-41).

Regarding claim 8, Dureau in view of Chen and further in view of Candelore discloses decrypting the CA encryption of the first transport stream in a settop box (STB) (Candelore, Fig. 2, 5, and 8, el. 296-el. 288, para. 40-41, para. 60-64, para. 84-85, para. 94).

8. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dureau in view of Chen and further in view of Candelore and further in view of Hendricks (US 7,073,187).

Regarding claim 9, Dureau in view of Chen and further in view of Candelore discloses all the limitation of claim 8. Dureau in view of Chen and further in view of Candelore further discloses demultiplexing, transcoding, and multiplexing the first and second payloads in a card of the set top box (Dureau, para. 35, and 39, Fig. 4-6, abstract, para. 32-33, para. 35-38, para. 43-44, para. 47, Chen, Fig. 1, para. 14, para. 21-22, transcoding unit is circuit card in the set top box performing demultiplexing, transcoding, and multiplexing funtion).

Dureau in view of Chen and further in view of Candelore does not explicitly disclose [demultiplexing, transcoding, and multiplexing the payloads] in a card inserted into a card slot of [the STB].

Hendricks teaches [demultiplexing, transcoding, and multiplexing the payloads] in a card inserted into a card slot of [the STB] (Fig. 52 b, col. 12, lines 31-47, col. 13, lines 18-43).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to modify Dureau in view of Chen and further in view of Candelore set top box to include [demultiplexing, transcoding, and multiplexing the payloads] in a card inserted into a card slot of [the STB], as taught by Hendricks, in order to replace the card inserted to the set top box in case if it goes bad.

9. Claims 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dureau in view of Chen and further in view of Candelore and further in view of Hendricks (US 7,073,187) and further in view of Park (5,757,909).

Regarding claim 10, Dureau in view of Chen and further in view of Candelore and further in view of Hendricks discloses all limitation of claim 9, and further discloses decode the data stream prior to the demultiplexing, transcoding, and multiplexing (Dureau, Fig. 4, para. 6, para. 38-39, Chen, Fig. 1, para. 14 and para. 21, Hendricks, Fig. 52 b, col. 12, lines 31-47, col. 13, lines 18-43).

Dureau in view of Chen and further in view of Candelore and further in view of Hendricks does not explicitly disclose [decoding] copy protection of the first transport stream [in the card].

Park teaches [decoding] copy protection of the first transport stream [in the card] (Fig. 6-9, col. 13, lines 1-67, col. 14, lines 21-67 ).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to modify Dureau in view of Chen and further in view of Candelore and further in view of Hendricks to include [decoding] copy protection of the first transport stream [in the card], as taught by Park, in order to perform the illegal viewing and copy protection (col.14, lines 65-67).

10. Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dureau in view of Chen and further in view of Candelore and further in view of Hendricks (US 7,073,187) and further in view of Park (5,757,909) and further in view of Orr (US 6,567,127 B1).

Regarding claim 11, Dureau in view of Chen and further in view of Candelore and further in view of Hendricks and further in view of park discloses all limitations of claim 10.

Dureau in view of Chen and further in view of Candelore and further in view of Hendricks and further in view of park does not explicitly discloses encoding copy protection to the second transport stream.

Orr teaches encoding copy protection to the second transport stream (Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 30-63).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to modify Dureau in view of Chen and further in view of Candelore and further in view of Hendricks and further in view of Park to include encoding copy protection to the second transport stream, as taught by Orr, in order to enhance the video data stream (col. 3, lines 50-52).

Regarding claim 12, Dureau in view of Chen and further in view of Candelore and further in view of Hendricks and further in view of park and further in view of Orr discloses transmitting the copy protection encoded second transport stream from the card to the STB (Dureau, Fig. 1-4, abstract, para. 33-36, Hendricks, Fig. 52b, col. 13, lines 16-43, col. 3, lines 30-col. 4, line 3, the encoded video stream is transferred to the set top box).

11. Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dureau in view of Agraharam (US 2002/009177 A1)

Regarding claim 17, Dureau discloses all limitation of claim 16.

Dureau does not explicitly disclose wherein the host is configured to only decode signals carried in the first payload type.

Art Unit: 2425

Agraharam teaches wherein the host is configured to only decode signals carried in the first payload type (para. 18, the MPEG-2 data stream is being decodes at the client terminal).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to modify Dureau to include wherein the host is configured to only decode signals carried in the first payload type, as taught by Agraharam, in order to decode and watch the MPEG data stream.

Regarding claim 18, Dureau in view of Agraharam discloses wherein the first payload type is associated with MPEG-2 protocols (Agraharam, para. 18).

12. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dureau in view of Chen and further in view of Hendricks (US 7,073,187).

Regarding claim 24, Dureau in view of Chen discloses all limitation of claim 23.

Dureau in view of Chen does not explicitly disclose wherein the unit is a card configured to insert within a slot of the STB.

Hendricks teaches wherein the unit is a card configured to insert within a slot of the STB (Fig. 52 b, col. 12, lines 31-47, col. 13, lines 18-43)

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to modify Dureau in view of Chen wherein the unit is a card configured to insert



Art Unit: 2425

within a slot of the STB, as taught by Hendricks, in order to replace the card inserted to the set top box in case if it goes bad.

13. Claims 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dureau in view of Chen and further in view of Yap (US 2002/0092021)

Regarding claim 25, Dureau in view of Chen discloses all limitation of claim 16. Dureau in view of Chen further discloses wherein the host is a video recorder

Dureau in view of Chen does not explicitly disclose wherein the host is a digital video recorder (DVR).

Yap teaches wherein the host is a digital video recorder (DVR) (para. 11).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to modify Dureau in view of Chen to include wherein the host is a digital video recorder (DVR), as taught by Yap, in order to digitally record the video program.

14. Claims 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dureau in view of Candelore and further in view of Hendricks.

Regarding claim 27, Dureau discloses all limitation of claim 26.

Dureau does not explicitly disclose wherein the transcoder is included with a card configured to insert within a slot of the legacy STBs and wherein the STB includes onboard conditional access decryption capabilities.

Canloelore teaches wherein the STB includes onboard conditional access decryption capabilities (Fig. 2, 5, and 8, el. 296-el. 288, para. 40-41, para. 60-64, para. 84-85, para. 94).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to modify Dureau in view of Chen to include wherein the STB includes onboard conditional access decryption capabilities, as taught by Candelore, in order to decrypt the TV signal (para. 40-41).

Dureau in view of Canloelore does not explicitly disclose wherein the transcoder is included with a card configured to insert within a slot of the legacy STBs.

Hendricks teaches wherein the transcoder is included with a card configured to insert within a slot of the legacy STBs (Fig. 52 b, col. 12, lines 31-47, col. 13, lines 18-43).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to modify Dureau in view of Canloelore to include wherein the transcoder is included with a card configured to insert within a slot of the legacy STBs, as taught by Hendricks, in order to replace the card inserted to the set top box in case if it goes bad.

15. Claims 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dureau in view of Candelore and further in view of Hendricks and further in view of Chen.

Regarding claim 28, Dureau in view of Candelore and further in view of Hendricks discloses all limitation of claim 27. Dureau in view of Candelore and further in view of Hendricks further discloses wherein the DTV signals are carried in payloads of a first transport stream, and wherein the transcoding unit further comprising a demultiplexer for determining whether the first transport stream includes payloads associated with the AVC standards or the non-AVC standards and wherein the transcoder transcodes the payloads associated with the AVC standards to payloads associated with the non-AVC standards and output to the legacy STB (Dureau, Fig. 3, para. 33-36, para. 44-47).

Dureau in view of Candelore and further in view of Hendricks does not explicitly discloses to transport payloads associated with [ the AVC standards] to the transcoder and to transport payloads associated with [the non-AVC standards] to a multiplexer, outputs the transcoded payloads to the multiplexer, and wherein the multiplexer combines the bypassed payloads with the transcoded payloads to a second transport stream [for output to the legacy STB].

Chen teaches to transport payloads associated with [ the AVC standards] to the transcoder and to transport payloads associated with [the non-AVC standards] to a multiplexer, outputs the transcoded payloads to the multiplexer, and wherein the multiplexer combines the bypassed payloads with the transcoded payloads to a second transport stream [for output to the legacy STB] (Fig. 1, para. 14, para. 20-21, and see the rejection on claim 21).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary in the art at the time of invention to modify Dureau in view of Candelore and further in view of Hendricks to include teaches to transport payloads associated with [ the AVC standards] to the transcoder and to transport payloads associated with [the non-AVC standards] to a multiplexer, outputs the transcoded payloads to the multiplexer, and wherein the multiplexer combines the bypassed payloads with the transcoded payloads to a second transport stream [for output to the legacy STB], as taught by Chen, in order to deliver the desired payload to the user.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CAI CHEN whose telephone number is (571)270-5679. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Pendleton can be reached on 571-272-7527. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2425

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

C. C.  
Examiner, Art Unit 2425

/Brian T. Pendleton/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2425